

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/714,987	11/17/2003	Yoshihiro Yazawa	1356-DIV-01	2265
35811 75	90 04/28/2005		EXAM	INER
IP GROUP OF DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP 1650 MARKET ST SUITE 4900 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			YEE, DEBORAH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	
			DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Commons	10/714,987	YOSHIHIRO YAZAWA ET AL
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Deborah Yee	1742
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ron. n. a reply within the statutory minimum of third eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	·	•
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is non-final.	•
3) Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice und	owance except for formal matt	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☑ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are pending in the apple 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	ndrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2003 Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ the drawing(s) be held in abeyan rrection is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docum 2. △ Certified copies of the priority docum 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No. <u>10/016,543</u> . received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	∧ □ ~	(DTO 442)
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11-17-03</u> .	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/714,987 Page 2

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European patent 675206, European patent 1113084, Kato et al (US Patent 6,113,710), European patent 930375 or Sato et al (US Patent 5,110,544) in view of Moyle et al (US Patent 5,859,095) or Omosako et al (US Patent 5,677,268).
- 3. EP'206 on lines 31 to 46 on page 7, EP'084 claims 4 to 5 on page 16, Kato claims 1 to 3 of column 9, EP'375 claims 1 to 6 on page 9, and Sato abstract, each discloses a ferritic stainless steel sheet having a composition with constituents whose wt% ranges overlap those recited by the claims; such overlap renders applicant's composition prima facie obvious because it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select the claimed alloy ranges from the broader disclosure of the prior art since the prior art has similar utility and properties, see MPEP 2144.05.
- 4. More specifically, note alloy examples 1-17 in Table 1 of columns 9-10 of Kato, Sato alloys 11 and 14 in Table 1 of columns 7 and 8, and EP'375 alloy 9 in Table 1 on page 8 which meet the claimed composition. Also EP'084 in Table 1 on page 9 and EP'206 in Table 1 on page 9 disclose examples which meet the claimed composition

Application/Control Number: 10/714,987

Art Unit: 1742

except do not contain V or Mo. It would, however, be obvious to include V or Mo since they are taught as additional alloying elements in the general disclosure of the prior art.

Page 3

- 5. Even though prior art does not teach lubricating steel surface with a coating comprising an acrylic resin, calcium stearate, and polyethylene wax as recited by the claims, such would not be a patentable difference. Note that it is well known in the art to coat steel surface with a lubricate to further enhance workability and corrosion resistance as evident by secondary teachings. Since enhance workability and corrosion resistance are properties desired and sought by primary prior art, then it would an obvious modification well within the skill of the artisan to apply lubricant to prior art steel surface to produce no more than the known and expected effect from such an additional step. Also the coating amount of 0.5 to 4.0 g/m2 would be a matter of choice and routine optimization well within the skill of the artisan and productive of no new and unexpected results.
- 6. Even though prior art does not teach a ridging height of about 50 microns or less at a 25% deformation in uni-axial stretch as recited by claim 4, such would be expected since compositional limitations are met and anti-ridging properties are taught, and in absence of proof to the contrary.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah Yee whose telephone number is 571-272-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 2:30.

Art Unit: 1742

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Deborah Yee Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1742